



# **Seat Management Workgroup**

## **Minutes**

Department of Information Technology  
3rd Floor Executive Conference Room  
(Richmond Plaza Building, 7<sup>th</sup> Street entrance, Richmond)

**May 21, 2001**

**2:00 pm**

### **Attendance**

#### **3 Members Present:**

Laverne Branch (DGS); Wayne Stafford (DOC); George Williams (UVA)

#### **5 Presenters, Guests, Staff and Representatives Present:**

Curt Diemer (SMS); Don Fraser (DynCorp); Ron Keister (GMU); Constance Scott (SMS); Chuck Tyger (SMS)

#### **8 Members Absent:**

Ed Ernouf (PDC); Joshua Heslinga (College of W&M); Steve Kelliher (VDOT); Ken Mittendorff (SC); Naseem Reza (VSP); Keith Segerson (GMU) Pete Stamps (Lottery); Rick Wilhelm (Fairfax County)

### **Welcome and Opening Remarks**

Wayne Stafford, Chairman of the Seat Management Workgroup, convened the meeting at 2:00 p.m.

### **Meeting Objectives**

Discuss outstanding issues regarding Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) studies and the Seat Management

state contracts.

## **Approval of minutes**

The minutes of the 4-23-2001 meeting were approved and will be placed on the COTS website.

## **Status of Three Previous action items**

1. None

## **TCO and Seat management**

### **Discussion**

Constance Scott (eGov-SMS) led the discussion regarding COTS. Issues were the contract modification process, TCO guidelines. The COTS executive director is considering a presentation of the minimum metrics at the next COTS meeting. Two TCO vendors have signed the contract mods. Unisys is expected to. A request to add Compaq and Dell to the contract has been received from DynCorp.

- A revision of the performance specs is underway and a draft will be available at next meeting.
- The state PC contracts have been awarded and are available to agencies as an alternative to Seat Management.
- ACS has opened an office in Richmond.
- A discussion of the Secretary of Technology's visit to the Department of Corrections took place. Challenges regarding funding, end of year spending, and the disposal of surplus funds were discussed.
- ETF funds were discussed.

### **Discussion**

The Chairman summarized the discussion items and made closing remarks. There were no action items.

## **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

## **Next Meeting**

June 25th 2:00 — 3:30 at DIT

Respectfully Submitted,

Curt Diemer  
Electronic Government Implementation  
Division  
Seat Management Section

---

Attachment 1

**Recommendation of the TCO Metrics Subgroup  
Presented to the Seat Management Workgroup**

**March 26, 2001  
Revised April 23, 2001**

**Charge**

The subgroup (Steve Kelliher, Chuck Tyger, George Williams) was charged with identifying key TCO metrics that should be provided to the Seat Management Section office.

**Recommendation**

Based on discussions with the TCO vendors and experience with TCO studies conducted by the Seat Management Section, the subgroup recommends that, at a minimum, the metrics listed in Table 1 and the Best Practices Implementation Status outlined in Table 2 be captured and reported by agencies and institutions of higher education.

Specifically, the subgroup identified three approaches to conducting a TCO study:

1. TCO studies based on the Gartner methodology

Studies conducted by the TCO vendors and the Seat Management Section employ the Gartner methodology. Agencies and institutions can acquire the software and training to conduct studies using the Gartner methodology. These studies should provide the metrics and Best Practices Implementation Status noted in the tables.

## 2. TCO studies based on a Gartner-compatible methodology

Agencies and institutions that have conducted a TCO study based on an industry recognized Gartner-compatible methodology should identify the methodology and provide at least Asset information (metrics A.1 — A.5), end user count (B.1), IT staff count (B.3), and direct hardware and software costs (C.1.a). In addition, the Best Practices Implementation Status should be completed.

## 3. TCO studies based on internally developed methodologies

Agencies and institutions that have conducted a TCO study based on an internally developed methodology should provide a description of the methodology and data collection process. Based on the study, at least Asset information (metrics A.1 — A.5), end user count (B.1), IT staff count (B.3), and direct hardware and software costs (C.1.a) should be provided. In addition, the Best Practices Implementation Status should be completed.

For the second and third approaches, the Seat Management Section will work with the agency or institution to complete the TCO Best Practices Implementation Status table.

Table 1 — TCO Baseline Metrics

### A. Assets

1. Current number of servers
2. Current number of client desktops
3. Current number of client mobile computers
4. Current number of peripherals
5. Current number of network devices

### B. Staff Data

1. Number of end users counted in the evaluation
2. End user average unburdened salary used in the evaluation
3. Number of IT staff allocated to supporting and maintaining the distributed computing environment in the evaluation

#### C. Actual Cost Data

##### 1. Direct Costs

- a. Hardware and software
- b. Operations
- c. Administration

##### 2. Indirect Costs

- a. End User Operations
- b. Downtime

Table 2 — TCO Best Practices Implementation Status

Best Practices	Typical Scope	Typical Level
Technology Improvements - Asset Management		
Automated Asset Management	0-100%	**
Software Inventory	0-100%	**
Hardware Inventory	0-100%	**
Automated Software Distribution	0-100%	**
Technology Improvements - Systems Management		

Virus Detection and Repair	0-100%	**
Systems Management	0-100%	**
Server Based Client Image Control	0-100%	**
User State Management and Restore	0-100%	**
Technology Improvements - Managed PC		
Unattended Power Up	0-100%	**
Client Hardware Event Management	0-100%	**
Low Impact Upgradeability	0-100%	**
Technology Improvements - Scalability		
Scalable Architecture	0-100%	**
Low Risk, High Quality Vendor/Provider Selection	0-100%	**
Technology Improvements - Business Protection		
Fault Tolerance	0-100%	**
Automated Backup and Restore	0-100%	**
Hardware Physical Security Management	0-100%	**
Technology Improvements - Service Desk		
Service Desk Problem Management and Resolution	0-100%	**

Client Remote Control	0-100%	**
Process Improvements - User Management		
Enterprise Policy Management	0-100%	**
Locked User Environment	0-100%	**
Data Security Management	0-100%	**
Change Management	0-100%	**
Process Improvements - Standardization		
Vendor Standardization	0-100%	**
Platform Standardization	0-100%	**
Application Standardization	0-100%	**
Centralized and Optimized Procurement	0-100%	**
Process Improvements - Practice Management		
More Time Spent Planning Versus Implementing	0-100%	**
Service Level Tracking and Management	0-100%	**
Capacity Planning	0-100%	**
TCO Lifecycle Management	0-100%	**
People Improvements		

User Training	0-100%	**
IS Training	0-100%	**
IS Staff Highly Motivated	0-100%	**
Stable IS Organization	0-100%	**

**\*\* Basic, Medium, or Advanced (See TCO Draft Guidelines)**